

## **REMARKS**

### **Amendments**

#### ***Amendments to the Claims***

Applicant has amended the pending independent claims to more particularly point out what Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Applicant's invention as claimed locally determines whether an entry corresponding to the particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

### **Rejections**

#### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

#### **Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40**

Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious by Sponheim et. al., U.S. Patent No. 6,639,610, in view of Williams et. al., US Patent No. 5,945,988. Applicant does not admit that Sponheim is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the reference at a later date. Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40.

Sponheim discloses assigning uniform resource locators (URLs) to graphical web objects, such as buttons. A user can select a particular URL to be assigned to a button. The URL assignment is stored in a cookie data structure. A cookie is a message passed back and forth between the web browser and the web server. The cookie is sent back to the web server each time the web browser requests a web page. The web server then uses the cookie to assign the URL to the button.

Williams discloses determining and dynamically updating user preferences in an entertainment system. A system controller uses the user preferences to configure the entertainment system. The system controller additionally offers supplemental

programming information by displaying the information in a separate window on a television. In addition, the system controller monitors the user's web page activity.

With regards to independent claims 17, 23, 29 and 35, Applicant claims locally determining whether an entry corresponding to the particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. In contrast, Sponheim discloses remotely assigning a URL to a button by using a cookie sent to the web server from the web browser. Furthermore, Williams discloses managing an entertainment system that includes monitoring the user's web page activity. Thus, neither Sponheim nor Williams teach or suggest locally determining whether an entry corresponding to a particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. Therefore, as the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 17, 23, 29 and 35 and claims 18, 21-24, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 36, 39 and 40 that depend on them, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

#### **Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38**

Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sponheim and Williams in view of Harris et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,635). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sponheim, Williams and Harris does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38. Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38 depend from independent claims 17, 23, 29 and 35. Because Sponheim and Williams do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 17, 23, 29 and 35, Harris must disclose at least the missing elements in order to have a *prima facie* case for the dependent claims.

However, Harris discloses a system for providing a discount credit-based transition network. Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Harris that teaches or suggests web pages. Thus, Harris does not teach or suggest locally determining whether an entry corresponding to the particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. Therefore, the combination cannot be interpreted as disclosing the claimed element and the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in

claims 17, 23, 29 and 35 and the claims depending from them (19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38). Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

### **SUMMARY**

Claims 17-40 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.


If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-3455.

### **Deposit Account Authorization**

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR  
& ZAFMAN LLP



Eric S. Replogle  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 52,161

Dated: August 20, 2004

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-3455